



KATIE HOBBS
SECRETARY OF STATE

July 7, 2020

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Office of the Attorney General
Government Accountability Unit
Attn: Linley Wilson
2005 N. Central Ave
Phoenix, AZ
Linley.wilson@azag.gov

Matter No.: SOS-LOB-2020-001, Failure to Amend Registration
Respondent: The Barry Goldwater Institute for Public Policy Research

Dear Ms. Wilson:

On February 25 and 28, 2020, HighGround, Inc. contacted the Secretary of State regarding potentially unlawful lobbying activity on behalf of the Barry Goldwater Institute for Public Policy Research by Mr. Jon Riches and Ms. Christina Sandefur. Both individuals are Goldwater employees and appeared before the Arizona State Legislature to advocate the position of the Goldwater Institute on pending legislation, despite the Goldwater Institute listing neither as an authorized lobbyist in its principal registration statement. This activity potentially violates A.R.S. § 41-1232, which requires a principal to amend its registration statement within five days of any change to its lobbying information.

The Secretary of State provided the Goldwater Institute the opportunity to submit a written response to address the concerns raised. In its Response, the Goldwater Institute asserted that it does not need to register employees who appear before legislative committees to argue for or against legislation as lobbyists because (1) they do not meet the statutory definition of "lobbyists for compensation" or "authorized lobbyists;" (2) their testimony meets statutory exceptions to the registration requirement; and (3) requiring registration would infringe upon the Goldwater Institute's freedom of expression and participation in government. *See* March 16, 2020 Response of Goldwater Institute, attached hereto as Exhibit 1. For the reasons explained below, however, the Secretary of State determines that there is reasonable cause to believe that the Goldwater Institute violated A.R.S. § 41-1232. Accordingly, the Secretary of State now refers this matter to the Attorney General for investigation pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 41-1237.01(A) and 41-1239(A)(2).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Legislative Testimony and Lobbying Complaint

The Goldwater Institute is registered as a lobbying principal through the Secretary of State's Office, with principal identification number 106605. Exhibit 1 at 2. On its registration, the Goldwater Institute's only lobbyist is its designated lobbyist, Ms. Jenna Bentley. *Id.*

Mr. Riches is the Goldwater Institute's Director of National Litigation and General Counsel. *Id.* at 4. He appeared before the Arizona House Regulatory Affairs Committee on February 17, 2020 to testify in support of H.B. 2817. *Airport fees prohibited; ride sharing: Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches) (available at http://azleg.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=23845&meta_id=585591). He signed the Legislature's "Request to Speak" system as representing himself, rather than the Goldwater Institute. *RTS Current Bill Positions for HB2817*, attached hereto as Exhibit 2. Despite this, he introduced himself as the Director of National Litigation at the Goldwater Institute, and at one point used the phrase "our view," referring to the view of the Goldwater Institute, when discussing the bill in question. *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches).

Further, Ms. Bentley, the Goldwater Institute's designated lobbyist, tweeted an image of Mr. Riches testifying with the caption "NOW: @GoldwaterInst's @Jon Riches testifying in support of HB2817 which keeps ride-share services at @PHXSkyHarbor and preempts the City's unconstitutional 200% fee increase #Prop126." Jenna Bentley (@JennaMBentley), Twitter (Feb. 17, 2020, 6:19 PM), <https://twitter.com/JennaMBentley/status/1229576011215294465>.

Ms. Sandefur is the Goldwater Institute's Executive Vice President. Exhibit 1 at 4. On February 20, 2020, Ms. Sandefur appeared before the Arizona Senate Commerce Committee to testify against S.B. 1554. *Short-term rental enforcement; penalties: Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur) (available at http://azleg.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=23917&meta_id=588144). Like Mr. Riches, Ms. Sandefur signed the "Request to Speak" system as representing herself. *RTS Current Bill Positions for SB1554*, attached hereto as Exhibit 3. When asked at the beginning of her testimony if she was representing herself or representing the Goldwater Institute, Ms. Sandefur stated she was representing herself, but told the Committee her Goldwater title. *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur). Immediately after this introduction, Ms. Sandefur expressed to the Committee that "we have serious concerns" about the bill in question. *Id.* (emphasis added). Later, she answered a question by expressing what she called "our opinion," again indicating the Goldwater Institute's position. *Id.*

On February 25, 2020, Mr. Jeffrey Kros, General Counsel of HighGround, Inc., contacted the Secretary of State's Office outlining the conduct of Mr. Riches and the Goldwater Institute and filing a complaint about Mr. Riches testifying on behalf of Goldwater despite not being listed as a lobbyist. See February 25, 2020 HighGround Complaint, attached hereto as Exhibit 4. On February 28, Mr. Kros contacted the Secretary of State's Office with a similar complaint detailing Ms. Sandefur's testimony. See February 28, 2020 HighGround Complaint, attached hereto as Exhibit

5. The Secretary of State's Office forwarded the complaints to the Goldwater Institute, which submitted its Response on March 16.

B. Goldwater Institute's Response and HighGround's Reply

In its Response, the Goldwater Institute argued that its failure to list employees as lobbyists did not result in a violation of Arizona lobbying laws. *See* Exhibit 1 at 1. It argued that (1) its employees do not meet the statutory definition of "lobbyists for compensation" or "authorized lobbyists"; (2) even if its employees were lobbyists, the conduct cited in the complaints fell under at least one statutory exception to lobbying registration requirements; and (3) requiring registration would infringe upon the Goldwater Institute's freedom of expression and freedom to participate in government. *Id.* at 3–7.

HighGround submitted a Reply to this Response on March 27. *See* March 27, 2020 HighGround Reply, attached hereto as Exhibit 6. It reiterated its position that the advocacy for or against legislation by Goldwater employees falls squarely under the definition of lobbying. *Id.* at 1. It further argued that the Goldwater Institute should list its employees as lobbyists because it is a registered principal, has registered a designated lobbyist, and "has registered authorized lobbyists, designated lobbyists and lobbyists for compensation on and off since 2011." *Id.* at 2.

ANALYSIS

A. General Lobbying Registration Requirements

Arizona law requires a principal to disclose in its registration statement "[t]he name and business address of each lobbyist for compensation or authorized lobbyist employed by, retained by, or representing the principal." A.R.S. § 41-1232(A)(3). A principal must amend its registration statement within five business days when any of the information on its registration statement changes. A.R.S. § 41-1232(C). Authorizing lobbying by an individual who does not appear on the principal's registration is one such change.

The Goldwater Institute did not amend its registration statement to list either Mr. Riches or Ms. Sandefur as lobbyists within five days of either individual testifying before the legislature. Therefore, whether the Goldwater Institute violated A.R.S. § 41-1232 turns first on whether these individuals meet the definition of either a "lobbyist for compensation" or an "authorized lobbyist." Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur are plainly not lobbyists for compensation under Arizona law. As the Goldwater Institute noted in its Response to the complaints, "[n]either Mr. Riches nor Ms. Sandefur are 'compensated for the primary purpose of lobbying'" Exhibit 1 at 4 (quoting A.R.S. § 41-1231(13)). However, the Secretary of State finds reasonable cause to believe that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur are authorized lobbyists. An authorized lobbyist is "any person, other than a designated lobbyist or lobbyist for compensation, who is employed by, retained by or representing a principal, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying and who is listed as an authorized lobbyist by the principal in its registration pursuant to § 41-1232." A.R.S. § 41-1231(1). In making a reasonable cause finding, the Secretary of State clarifies her interpretation of two elements of this definition.

1. Representing a Principal for the Purpose of Lobbying

In its Response, the Goldwater Institute argues that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur are not authorized lobbyists because they are not “employed by . . . the [Goldwater Institute] for the purpose of lobbying.” Exhibit 1 at 4 (quoting A.R.S. § 41-1231(1)). This argument ignores key language applicable to Mr. Riches’ and Ms. Sandefur’s conduct. Specifically, authorized lobbyists are not only those “employed” for the purpose of lobbying, but also those “representing a principal, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying . . .” A.R.S. § 41-1231(1).

Although Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur signed their respective Requests to Speak as representing themselves, their testimony indicates that they were in fact representing the Goldwater Institute and the Goldwater Institute’s Response does not argue otherwise. *Compare* Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3 with *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches) and *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur). Both individuals clearly stated their affiliation with the Goldwater Institute at the beginning of their testimony. *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches); *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur). Further, their testimony included statements using the words “we” and “our,” thereby communicating to legislators that they were representing the Goldwater Institute’s position on the relevant bills. *Id.* The fact that neither is employed for the primary purpose of lobbying nor compensated specifically for lobbying activities does not foreclose a finding that they were acting as authorized lobbyists given this representation.

Additionally, Mr. Riches’ and Ms. Sandefur’s testimony demonstrates that they were representing the Goldwater Institute “for the purpose of lobbying.” In relevant part, A.R.S. § 41-1231(11) defines lobbying as “attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by directly communicating with any legislator . . .” Both Goldwater employees explicitly advocated before legislative committees for or against pending bills, and in doing so directly communicated with the legislators sitting on those committees. *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches); *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur). This conduct therefore qualifies as lobbying.

2. “Circular” Definition of Authorized Lobbyist

The Goldwater Institute suggests that the definition of an “authorized lobbyist” is circular in nature, and thereby relieves any duty to register Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur as lobbyists.¹

¹ Although the Goldwater Institute discusses this point in the context of its employees’ legal obligation to personally register as lobbyists, only the legal obligations of the Goldwater Institute as the principal are at issue here. The personal registration requirement created by A.R.S. § 41-1232.05 applies only to “[a] person *who is listed by a principal or public body on a registration form* pursuant to § 41-1232 or 41-1232.01 as a lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist . . .” (emphasis added). As the Goldwater Institute listed neither employee on its registration form, the law creates no legal duty for the individuals. Furthermore, neither employee meets the definition of a “lobbyist for compensation,” “designated lobbyist,” or “designated public lobbyist,” thereby making A.R.S. § 41-1232.05 inapplicable even if they had been listed as authorized lobbyists on the Goldwater Institute’s registration.

Exhibit 1 at 3–4 n.1. An “authorized lobbyist” is “any person, other than a designated lobbyist or lobbyist for compensation, who is employed by, retained by or representing a principal, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying *and who is listed as an authorized lobbyist by the principal in its registration pursuant to § 41-1232*,” A.R.S. § 41-1231(1) (emphasis added). Similarly, the definitions of “authorized public lobbyist,” “designated lobbyist,” “designated public lobbyist,” “lobbyist,” and “lobbyist for compensation” also require that a person be “listed as a lobbyist by the principal in its registration” in order for the person to meet the definition of each type of lobbyist. A.R.S. § 41-1231(2)–(4), (13). A.R.S. § 41-1232(A)(3), in turn, requires a principal to list in its lobbying registration “[t]he name and business address of each lobbyist for compensation or authorized lobbyist employed by, retained by or representing the principal.” Accordingly, a limited reading of these statutes might lead to the conclusion that the Goldwater Institute can control whether Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur are considered authorized lobbyists by choosing whether to list them as lobbyists in its registration.

However, this interpretation would produce the absurd result that no principal is ever legally obligated to list a lobbyist for compensation or authorized lobbyist under A.R.S. § 41-1232 unless the principal has already chosen to list that person as a lobbyist in its registration. This interpretation also ignores the prefatory phrase “unless the context otherwise requires” which applies to all definitions under A.R.S. § 41-1231. The phrase indicates that the relevant definitions “are not to be applied mechanistically and rigidly.” *State v. Heylmun*, 708 P.2d 778, 780 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1985). Instead, the definitions should be interpreted using the legislative intent of the law based on the context in which the language appears. *See, e.g., Walgreen Arizona Drug Co. v. Arizona Dept. of Revenue* 97 P.3d 896, 898–99 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2004).

Here, the Arizona legislature could not have intended to render the state’s lobbyist registration statute ineffectual and entirely optional through a circular definition. “Authorized lobbyist” as it is used in A.R.S. § 41-1232 appears in the *context* of the statute requiring registration. In other words, the context of A.R.S. § 41-1232 requires “authorized lobbyist” to be understood as a person who meets the definition from A.R.S. § 41-1231 upon being listed or who is required to be listed in a principal’s registration statement pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1232.

B. Statutory Exceptions

Finding reasonable cause to believe that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur qualify as authorized lobbyists, whether there is reasonable cause to believe the Goldwater Institute violated its obligations to list them as lobbyists pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1232 then depends on whether any statutory exceptions to the registration requirement apply. The Secretary of State does not find reasonable cause to believe that the conduct cited in the complaints falls under any such exceptions.

1. Natural Persons Appearing for Themselves

While the Goldwater Institute did not raise this claim in its Response, the Secretary of State considered the statutory exception to lobbyist registration requirements for “[a] natural person who merely appears for himself before a committee of the legislature . . . to lobby in support of or in opposition to legislation or official action.” A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(2). However, “[an] employee must be registered if the employee appears on behalf of [an] organization for the purpose of influencing legislation.” Ariz. Op. Atty. Gen. No. I87-152 (Ariz. A.G.) 1987 WL 121380.

Although Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur claimed to be representing themselves when they testified, the context and content of their testimony indicate that they were in fact representing the Goldwater Institute, and the Goldwater Institute's Response does not argue otherwise. Both identified themselves as employees of the Goldwater Institute and used inclusive language to indicate they were espousing the views of their employer through their testimony.² See *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches); *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur). Therefore, A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(2) is inapplicable.

2. Persons who Answer Technical Questions or Provide Technical Information

The registration requirement in A.R.S. § 41-1232 does not apply to a “person acting in the . . . capacity” of “[a] person who answers technical questions or provides technical information at the request of a lobbyist, designated public lobbyist, authorized public lobbyist or legislator and who makes no expenditures required to be reported . . .” A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(4). The Goldwater Institute claims that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur are such persons. Exhibit 1 at 5–6. In doing so, it relies on their experience in the policy areas related to the bills in question. *Id.* However, it does not establish that they were acting in the capacity of persons providing technical information, or that the testimony was technical in nature.

Based on the content of their testimony, Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur were not acting in the capacity of individuals who provide technical information, but rather that of policy advocates urging legislators to adopt a desired position. Their opening statements conveyed a purpose of persuasion, rather than information. See *Hearing on H.B. 2817 Before the H. Comm. on Regulatory Affairs*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Jon Riches) (“I’m testifying in support of House Bill 2817. This bill would correct one of the most punishing policies the City of Phoenix has put in place, and it would override what was a plainly illegal act.”); *Hearing on S.B. 1554 Before the S. Comm. on Commerce*, 54th Leg., 2d Regular Sess. (Ariz. 2020) (statement of Christina Sandefur) (“This bill, I know, is well-intentioned, but we have serious concerns with some of the components because they’re unnecessary, unfair, and frankly some of them are unconstitutional.”). Their subsequent testimony consisted predominantly of additional opinions about the bills, as well as speculation as to the effects of the legislation. *Id.*

Although Arizona law does not expressly define “technical” information, the usage of the term in other jurisdictions illustrates why the subjective claims and opinions expounded here are not technical in nature. For example, United States Treasury regulations state that “opinions and recommendations” do not qualify as technical advice or assistance in the context of influencing legislation unless “specifically requested by the government body . . . or directly related to the materials so requested.” 26 C.F.R. § 53.4945-2(d)(2)(ii). Similarly, Michigan law defines technical information as “empirically verifiable data provided by a person recognized as an expert in the

² The Goldwater Institute does not argue that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur were representing themselves through their testimony. Instead, its Response explained that only its designated lobbyist signs in on behalf of the organization, while all other employees sign as themselves “because that is the only option if the principal has not named a person as a lobbyist in its registration.” Exhibit 1 at 2.

subject area to which the information provided is related.” Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 4.415(2). Here, the opinions and recommendations shared by Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur on behalf of the Goldwater Institute do not reflect empirically verifiable or substantiated facts, but rather normative policy positions and objectives sought by the Goldwater Institute. As such, an exception under A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(4) is inapplicable.

3. Attorneys Representing Clients before a Court or Quasi-Judicial Body

A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(6) provides an exception for “[a]n attorney who represents clients before any court or before any quasi-judicial body.” The Goldwater Institute claims that this exception is applicable because the employees cited in the complaints are both licensed attorneys. Exhibit 1 at 6. However, this interpretation ignores the key language in A.R.S. § 41-1232.04 that the registration requirements “do not apply to a person *if that person is acting in the following capacity . . .*” (emphasis added). Even when an attorney performs services that may qualify for an exception to the registration requirements in certain contexts, those exceptions “will normally have no application to lawyers who are appearing before legislative committees, since in such cases the appearance normally will involve testimony regarding the merits of the bill . . .” See Ariz. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 76-294 (R76-266) (Ariz. A.G.). Neither Mr. Riches nor Ms. Sandefur appeared before a legislative committee in the role of an attorney representing a client. Instead, they appeared as policy advocates testifying on the merits of pending legislation. Furthermore, a legislative committee is not a “court or quasi-judicial body” before which testimony would qualify for an exception under the law. Ultimately, interpreting A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(6) to cover the conduct of Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur would allow “every lobbyist with a Bar license [to] claim this exemption and de-register or not register as a lobbyist at all.” Exhibit 4 at 2. Accordingly, an exception under A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(6) is inapplicable.

4. Natural Persons who are Members of an Association

The Goldwater Institute is not entitled to an exception under A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(8) as an association. The law grants an exception to “[a] natural person who is a member of an association, who is not the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or authorized lobbyist for the association . . .” While there is a dearth of case law interpreting this and other provisions of Arizona’s lobbying laws, the Secretary of State believes this exception was intended to apply to individuals who are members of a membership association but who are appearing on their own behalf rather than on behalf of the organization of which they happen to be a member. For example, the Arizona Medical Association is a voluntary membership organization for all Arizona medical and osteopathic physicians.³ It is registered as a principal with the Secretary of State’s Office and has listed its designated lobbyist as well as multiple lobbyists for compensation and authorized lobbyists.⁴ Under A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(8), the thousands of physicians who are its members may

³ See <https://www.azmed.org/>.

⁴ Arizona Secretary of State Lobbyist System, Principal/Public Body Information, Arizona Medical Association, https://apps.azsos.gov/scripts/Lobbyist_Search.dll/ZoomPPB?PPB_ID=100047, attached hereto as Exhibit 9.

testify before the legislature on their own behalf without necessarily triggering registration requirements.⁵

It is helpful to consider this exception in conjunction with A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(2)'s exception for natural persons appearing on their own behalf. A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(8) makes clear that being a member of an association does not foreclose a natural person's ability to rely on the exception in A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(2) and appear on their own behalf without triggering lobbyist registration requirements. Hence, the statute requires that the person "is not the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or authorized lobbyist for the association" in order for the exception to apply. A.R.S. § 41-1232.04(8).

Here, there is no indication that the Goldwater Institute is a membership association or that, its employees, Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur, are "members" as contemplated by this statutory exception.⁶ Further, the Secretary of State's conclusion that there is reasonable cause to believe that Mr. Riches and Ms. Sandefur acted as authorized lobbyists on behalf of the Goldwater Institute also renders this exception inapplicable.

C. Political Expression and Participation in Government

The Goldwater Institute claims that requiring it to list employees who appear before committees as lobbyists would violate A.R.S. § 41-1238's guarantee that no provision of Arizona's lobbying laws infringe upon rights to expression or participation in government. Exhibit 1 at 7. Requiring the disclosure of lobbying activities and registration of lobbyists, however, does not violate the First Amendment. *See U.S. v. Harriss*, 347 U.S. 612, 625–26 (1954) (holding that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act did not violate First Amendment freedoms to "speak, publish, or petition the Government," because the law did not prohibit lobbying, but rather required the disclosure of limited information Congress deemed necessary for transparency and self-protection).

Arizona's registration requirement does not restrict freedom of expression or participation in government. In this case, requiring the Goldwater Institute to list employees as lobbyists before those employees appear before committees is minimally intrusive, and would do nothing to limit their access to the committees or the ability to communicate their desired message. To list a new authorized lobbyist, a principal simply provides to the Secretary of State's Office an "Add or Remove Lobbyists and Employees" form (attached hereto as Exhibit 8) bearing the employee's name, e-mail address, phone number, and business address within five days of the lobbying activity. The simple form may be uploaded to lobbying.az.gov, emailed, faxed, or dropped off at the Secretary of State's Office. Further, the United States Supreme Court has flatly rejected claims, such as the one proposed by the Goldwater Institute here, that registration requirements create an unconstitutional chilling effect. *Compare* Exhibit 1 at 7 *with Harriss*, 347 U.S. at 626 ("[E]ven

⁵ The lobbying statutes in Title 41 do not define "association," but the only definition of "association" elsewhere in the Arizona Revised Statutes reinforces this view. A.R.S. § 10-2001(3) defines "association" as a corporation organized under Title 10, Ch. 19, Art. 1 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, which governs cooperative marketing associations that "admit as members persons engaged in production of the products or services to be handled by or through the association." *See* A.R.S. § 10-2008.

⁶ The Goldwater Institute does not identify itself as an association or as having members on its I.R.S. form 990. Goldwater Institute I.R.S. Form 990, attached hereto as Exhibit 7.

assuming some such deterrent effect, the restraint is at most an indirect one resulting from self-censorship . . . ”).

As a result, the Goldwater Institute’s assertion that A.R.S. § 41-1238 protects it from § 41-1232’s registration requirements is unpersuasive and does not preclude a finding of reasonable cause to believe a lobbying violation occurred.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the Secretary of State concludes there is reasonable cause to believe that the Goldwater Institute violated A.R.S. § 41-1232 and refers this matter to the Attorney General for further investigation pursuant to §§ 41-1237.01(A) and 41-1239(A)(2).

Sincerely,



Sambo (Bo) Dul
State Elections Director
Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs

cc:

Kathleen E. Brody
Lee Stein
Mitchell | Stein | Carey | Chapman, PC
One Renaissance Square
2 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1450
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Kathy@MSCCLaw.com
Lee@MSCCLaw.com

Jenna Bentley, Designated Lobbyist
Jon Riches
Christina Sandefur
The Barry Goldwater Institute for Public Policy Research
500 E. Coronado Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Jbentley@goldwaterinstitute.org
Jriches@goldwaterinstitute.org
Csandefur@goldwaterinstitute.org

Jeffrey J. Kros
HighGround Public Affairs
830 N 4th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

jkros@azhighground.com